

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 6-13 and 19-22 for informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application 2001/0047507 to Pileggi, et al. (Pileggi). In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 8, 13-14, 19 and 20, but have not added or canceled any claim. Accordingly, claims 1-22 will be pending in the application after entry of this Amendment.

I. Objection to Claims 6-13, and 19-22

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to independent claims 6 and 8 for lack of antecedent basis and to claim 13 for use of "can be." The Examiner objected to claims 7, 9-13 and 19-22 by virtue of dependence on the independent claims. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 6 to recite "quality of the routing solution," claim 8 to recite "a length of the route," and claim 13 to recite "the best routing solution is identified." In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 6-13 and 19-22.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-13 Under §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Pileggi. Claims 2-13 are dependent on claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method that routes a group of nets. The method identifies different routing solutions for the nets in the group of nets. The method selects a best routing solution based on the identified different routing solutions. The method routes the group of nets based on the best routing solution.

Applicants respectfully submit that Pileggi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. The cited portion of Pileggi describes the placement of circuit elements based on

signal delay. Thus, Pileggi does not mention several limitations recited in claim 1. For instance, Pileggi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest routing a group of nets based on a best routing solution.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pileggi does not anticipate or otherwise
5 invalidate claim 1. Since claims 2-13 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Pileggi does not anticipate or otherwise invalidate claims 2-13 for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claims 1-13.

III. Rejection of Claims 14-22 Under §102(e)

10 The Examiner rejected claims 14-22 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Pileggi. Claims 15-22 are dependent on claim 14. Claim 14 recites a computer program embedded on a computer readable medium. The computer program has sets of instructions that route a group of nets. The instructions identify different routing solutions for the nets in the group of nets and select a best routing solution based on the identified different routing solutions. The instructions
15 route the group of nets based on the best routing solution.

Applicants respectfully submit that Pileggi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a computer program. The cited portion of Pileggi describes the placement of circuit elements based on signal delay. Thus, Pileggi does not mention several limitations recited in claim 1. For instance, Pileggi does not disclose, teach, or even suggest routing a group of nets based on a best
20 routing solution.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Pileggi does not anticipate or otherwise render unpatentable claims 14-22. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claims 14-22.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all claims, namely claims 1-22, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

5 This Amendment is submitted with a petition and fee for a one month extension of time. Accordingly, Applicants believe no additional fee is required. However, in the unlikely event that the Patent Office determines that additional fees, extension, and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Assistant Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or fees due in connection with
10 the filing of this document, or to credit any overpayment, to **Deposit Account: 50-1128** referencing docket: SPLX.P0072. However, the Assistant Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

15 STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 03/04/2005


Andy T. Pho
Reg. No. 48,862

20 Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1050
Century City, CA 90067
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x303
Fax: (310) 785-9558